

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
8 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
9

10 IN RE: BEXTRA AND CELEBREX  
11 MARKETING SALES PRACTICES AND  
12 PRODUCT LIABILITY LITIGATION,  
13 \_\_\_\_\_/

CASE NO. 05-1699 CRB

MDL No. 1699 CRB

**ORDER RE JULY 2, 2009 and JULY 6,  
2009 SUBMISSIONS**

14 *This document relates to:*

15 Edward Earl Thomas, 06-3674 CRB  
16 \_\_\_\_\_/

17 The Court received on July 2, 2009 various materials from pro se plaintiff Edward E.  
18 Thomas. These include a June 17, 2009 letter sent to Plaintiff by Defendants in his suit  
19 against Pfizer, Inc. Plaintiff has appended to the letter a note stating that he received the  
20 letter 7 days late and that “first was last now second sent do not understand now while asian  
21 inmates threaten to harm/kill on third party (governmental involvement) FBI and etc.” The  
22 Court construes Plaintiff’s note to mean that he did not understand Defendants’ letter;  
23 nonetheless, Plaintiff has sent a letter to this chambers (received June 29, 2009) which  
24 appears to be responsive to Defendants’ letter. To the extent that Plaintiff is also  
25 complaining about threats he is receiving from other inmates, this is beyond the scope of  
26 Plaintiff’s suit against Pfizer, Inc. As the Court has already advised Plaintiff, he may  
27 challenge these conditions, if he wishes to do so, in an appropriate forum.

28 The Court received on July 6, 2009 two more submissions from Plaintiff that appear  
entirely unrelated to his case against Pfizer, Inc. The first includes a “Last Will and  
Testament,” two letters requesting a female attorney and complaining about Health & Human

1 Services not “changing the antidote,” a letter complaining of mail fraud, and a copy of  
2 Plaintiff’s hearing results from the Saginaw County Sheriff’s Office. The second includes a  
3 letter complaining of mail fraud and sabotage, among other things, and a note requesting the  
4 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The Court cannot discern the purpose of these materials,  
5 and cannot provide Plaintiff with the relief he appears to seek..

6 To the extent Plaintiff has made a motion to this Court it is DENIED.

7 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

8 Dated: July 8, 2009



9 CHARLES R. BREYER  
10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE